

NCO-40-SF - FORCE PROTECTION (PIERSIDE) PLAN EXECUTION EXERCISE

PURPOSE

Evaluate ship's ability to execute a Force Protection Plan to counter a potential terrorist threat originating from shore while the ship is moored to a pier.

This exercise will be conducted using the plan developed in conjunction with NCO-39-SF, FORCE PROTECTION (PIERSIDE) PLAN-NING EXERCISE.

This exercise should be conducted using TM SWDG 3-20.4-01, Surface Ship Force Protection in an Asymmetrical Environment.

REQUIREMENTS

A trusted agent cell, either the ship's own FP training team or an assist team from another command, will plan and execute measures designed to test ship's FP posture during exercise.

PROCEDURES

OCE

1. Designate trusted agent cell. The cell should have the requisite expertise to conduct convincing measures to test exercise ship's FP posture during execution of exercise. Outside assistance from ac-

tivities with FP knowledge should be exploited where available.

2. Establish an exercise vulnerability period. Minimum period is four hours. If desired, this may be planned for a longer period so that the exercise encompasses both daylight and nighttime periods.
3. If applicable, notify non-exercise ships in area of exercise period to minimize conflicts with exercise activity. If feasible, arrange to have ship moored in a location to minimize outside interference.
4. Evaluate exercise based on evaluation section below.

EXERCISE SHIP

1. Execute FP plan at start of exercise vulnerability period.

SAFETY

In conducting a scenario-based training exercise of this type, imagination and ingenuity are important ingredients in making the exercise realistic and the training effective. However, the OCE and CO of the exercise ship must ensure that these efforts do not create potential safety problems. In all cases the use of force will be simulated. Operational Risk Management will be used to evaluate intrusion plans to assure a safe environment is maintained.

EVALUATION

GENERAL

1. Was FP plan effectively executed?
2. If host nation support/liaison was part of the plan, was it conducted in an effective manner?
3. Were internal and external communications effective?
4. Were appropriate external reports made?

PERIMETER

1. Was ship's FP perimeter defined, demarcated and defended?
2. Did perimeter provide visual indication of limits to FP personnel?
3. Were tripwires established?
4. Was Force Protection Action Officer (FPAO) effective in coordinating FP maintenance of perimeter?

5. Were topside sentries manned by qualified ship's security watchstanders?
6. Were topside sentries fitted out with body armor, appropriate weapons, radios and whistles?
7. Were topside sentries well versed in warning procedures?

SEARCH PROCEDURES

1. Was vehicle access to the pier controlled?
2. Was each vehicle searched outside of the primary point of entry?
3. Were communication maintained with the ship from the search location?
4. Were unknown or unidentified personnel searched at the outermost perimeter entry point?
5. If part of the plan, was a second checkpoint established to search known personnel?
6. Was a separate search area designated for the receipt of provisions?
7. Were search procedures effective?

WARNING PROCEDURES

1. Were signs posted at all pierside entry points and at various points along the perimeter?
2. Were signs brightly colored and large enough to be read from a distance?
3. Were signs lighted so they could be read at night?
4. Were signs written in the predominate language of the host nation and English?
5. Were personnel warned to remain clear of the immediate area and that access was restricted?
6. For personnel or vehicles that did not respond to signage, signals or initial warnings, were additional warnings made and were they warned that they would be subject to defensive measures?

WEAPONS EMPLOYMENT

1. Were all personnel PQS qualified on weapons carried?
2. Were all personnel carrying weapons trained in the use of deadly force?
3. Were small arms deployed in an effective manner; i.e., appropriate for threat direction, overlapping fields of fire and 360 degree protection?
4. Were all personnel carrying weapons familiar with the types of fire to be employed and tactics for engaging vehicles and personnel?
5. In the event of an attack, were personnel alert to the possibility of a second attack from a different axis?

USE OF LIGHTING

1. Were sentry posts well lit with portable lighting? Lighting should be directed outward, away from the sentry post and away from the ship.
2. Was deck edge lighting employed?
3. If moored to pier, was lighting used to illuminate area under the pier?

NON-LETHAL METHODS

1. Did FP plan include the use of non-lethal methods, where appropriate?